



4. In addition to Plaintiffs, we met with a music producer and musician, during which we collectively went over the issues of the case in detail.
5. For example, during the meetings, we asked the Plaintiffs and the music producer to carefully listen to Plaintiffs' copyrighted song and the alleged infringing song of the Defendants, and to explain to us specifically what they deemed substantially similar. The music producer assisted us in transcribing the music to both songs. The music producer and Plaintiffs also assisted us in isolating specific aspects of the songs, such as the melody, that they deemed substantially similar.
6. We also attended a side-by-side musicologist analysis of the two songs, which entailed both works being played simultaneously, with a computer generated graph demonstrating the similarities in the two works.
7. We also reviewed the various pieces of correspondence and documents provided to us from our clients that pertained to issues of access and copyright ownership.
8. Based on our review of all of the evidence, our various meetings with Plaintiffs and a music producer, and the side-by-side musical analysis, my partner and I concluded that Plaintiffs' had a good faith, objectively reasonable basis to assert Defendants infringed their copyright.

Executed this \_\_\_\_\_ day of June, 2003, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

---

George Bochetto, Esquire